



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner again explained to applicants that the claims were replete with intended use statements that did not allow for patentable weight to be given to the function associated therewith.

Examiner also again described that claims 1 and 31 recited features not recited in claim 23 that potentially rendered the claims distinct, and that applicants would need to recite amendments that properly recite or remove recitation of the inventoried bag and hidden virtual objects of claim 23 in order to make the substantive features of claims 1, 23, and 31 non-distinct.

Examiner also stated that the character represented by the computer generation should be recited as a player character that is distinct from the plural virtual objects that are possessed by the player character, that the one or more other characters should be recited as non-player characters distinct from the player character, and that the inventory filter icon appeared to be selected by the player and does not perform the act of selecting.

Applicants will consider and provide the Examiner with draft proposed amendments that address the above stated issues in order to obviate further rejection under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Shimakawa, DeStefano and Logg.